disparity as between the grants made to the two most important departments of Government, *viz.*, Agriculture and Education. While as much as Rs. 52 lakhs had been provided for education, only Rs. 10 lakhs had been provided for agriculture. He stressed that as between the two, the Agricultural Department was certainly more important, because while education, no doubt, led to knowledge. agriculture provided food which was necessary for the very existence of the individual. Education was certainly desirable, but it was possible for men to live even without education. Without food, however, life would be impossible. For these reasons, he requested that a very much larger grant be made for agriculture. When this was done and people had enough to eat, they would begin to appreciate education, take to it more kindly, and educational progress, accompanied by agricultural advance, would make for the country's prosperity on sound and lasting lines.

After complimenting the Dewan for the many great works carried out during his term of office, the speaker commented that the list of achievements, long though it was, somehow looked blank on account of the failure of the Government so far to take up one work of outstanding importance and utility, *viz.*, the Shimsha bridge in respect of which repeated representations had been made by the representatives of the Malvalli Taluk at almost every session of the Assembly for the past several years.

The PRESIDENT replied that Government were hoping to sanction the bridge in the course of the budget year and that, in the meantime, the District Board had been asked to provide its quota of the cost.

At 6-5 p.m., the House rose for the day to meet again at 12 of the clock the following day.

FOURTH DAY.

Thursday, 17th June 1937.

The House reassembled at 12 of the clock in the Jagan Mohan Palace Pavilion on Thursday, 17th June 1937, *Rajamantrapravina* S. P. Rajagopalachari, First Member of Council, in the Chair.

At the outset, **Mr. B. L. BYANNA** pointed out that as against 6 days usually allowed for the Budget Session of the Assembly, only 5 days had been allowed for the present session, of which elections to the Senate and to each of the panels of the three Standing Committees as also the taking of the oath of allegiance by every member of the House practically covered a day. Government Business also had taken away half a day. Thus even 4 full days were not left for non-official business. There were many more members who wished to speak on the Budget. Besides, Resolutions on the Budget and General Resolutions and Representations had yet to be gone through. The remaining time would not be sufficient for transacting all these items of business. This was why sometimes as many as 7 days used to be allotted for the budget session of the House in the past. In the circumstances, he requested extension of the period of the session by at least a day.

MANY MEMBERS joined Mr. Byanna in making this request.

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI promised to consider the request.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—*contd.*

Grants to Municipalities.

Q.—33. **Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA** (Tirthahalli Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) what grants have been sanctioned by Government to the several municipalities in the State from June 1934 to end of 1936 ;

(*b*) out of this, how much has been sanctioned for the major municipalities; what are their names; what is the amount granted to each such municipality ;

(*c*) (i) what is the total number of minor municipalities; (ii) what are their names; (iii) what is the amount granted to each of them? (Yearwar details may kindly be furnished.)

A.—**The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (Mr. M. Venkatanaranappa).**—

(*a*) and (*b*) *Vide* statement appended (Appendix).

(*c*) (i) 65.

(ii) *Vide* statement attached (Appendix).

(iii) *Vide*, replies to clauses (*a*) and (*b*) *supra*.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—On what basis are grants to the several municipalities sanctioned?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Grants are sanctioned to the municipalities if they have improvement works ready for execution. The municipalities concerned must themselves provide the funds for schemes of improvement, such as drainage, water supply, etc. And where their resources do not permit of the entire cost of such undertakings being met by them, Government help them with funds.

Mr. Tudki RAMANNA GOWDA.—The grants to minor municipalities aggregate about Rs. 10,000 while those to town municipalities aggregate more than Rs. 50,000, as can be seen from the appendix to the answer. May I know why this invidious distinction is made?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Government have no intention of making invidious distinctions. The grants are sanctioned as and when schemes mature and are approved by the Department of Health. So, whichever municipalities send up schemes approved by the Director of Health, will receive grants. For the past two years, grants to municipalities were no doubt very limited In the budget year, however, it is proposed to sanction grants to a large number of minor municipalities.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—Is it not possible to provide grants for minor and town municipalities separately, instead of clubbing them together as at present?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Sanction of funds depends upon schemes being ready and the concerned local bodies agreeing to pay their own quota. If there are no schemes or if the local bodies are not in a position to provide the necessary funds, there will be no need for Government reserving any grants for them. There is thus no object in separating the grants. In fact, it cannot be anticipated whether the grants are going to be utilised in full, and if so, by minor municipalities or by town municipalities.

Mr. T. MADIAH GOWDA.—If separate allotments are not made, the minor municipalities apprehend that they may not get any grants at all.

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—There are no grounds for such an apprehension.

Mr. MIR MAHOMED SAB.—Are the Government aware that Amildars, being Presidents of the municipalities, are diverting the grants made for major municipalities towards the improvement of minor municipalities, and if so, will the Government be pleased to see that the grants made for particular purposes are utilised only for such purposes, and also not to divert to any other purpose the grants made for rural improvement?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The point will be noted.

Mr. B. N. BORANNA GOWDA.—If a minor municipality sends up a scheme but has no finance for undertaking it and applies to Government for funds, will the Government sanction the scheme and provide funds therefor in preference to any scheme of a town municipality which may be awaiting sanction?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—Each individual case will be considered on merits when the proposal is received.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that the Deputy Commissioner is recommending sanction of grants for only particular municipalities every year although other municipalities have schemes ready and are also prepared to contribute their quota of the expenditure? In particular, will the Government be pleased to inquire why, when the Srinivasapur Municipal Council solicited sanction to a drainage scheme at a heavy cost and was also prepared to contribute its quota in accordance with a three-year programme, sanction was not accorded to the scheme and the balance of cost not provided?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—We shall inquire.

Mr. S. RAMAPPA.—Are the Government aware that three-fourths of the lumpsum allotment for town and minor municipalities are used up for the improvement of town municipalities only in certain districts?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—The grant is not allotted by districts. According as schemes become ready and are sent to Government, funds will be sanctioned

Mr. S. RANGARAMIAH.—Have the Government sanctioned, as a matter of course, grants in all cases where schemes have been submitted?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—That is not always possible.

Nawab SHER KHAN.—Has the Honnali Municipality sent up any drainage scheme, and if so, may I know why the scheme has not been sanctioned?

Mr. M. VENKATANARANAPPA.—It will come up for consideration this year.

Dam across Seegehalla.

Q.—34. Messrs. N. G. RUDRAPPA and Patel BASAPPA (Shimoga Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that a survey has been made for the construction of a dam across Seegehalla which flows from Shankar Gudda, in order to supply water through channels to a few tanks of Kumsi Sub-Taluk and Shimoga Taluk;

(*b*) what are the names of the tanks that get supply of water;

(*c*) what is the amount of the estimate?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT, PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT (Mr. R. W. Scaldwell).—

(*a*) and (*c*) A project has been prepared costing Rs. 99,000.

(*b*) A statement of the tanks that are proposed to be supplied is attached (*vide* Appendix).

Mr. N. G. RUDRAPPA.—When was the project prepared?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—In 1922.

Mr. N. G. RUDRAPPA.—How many acres are expected to be supplied with water by the proposed project?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—About 2,800 acres.

Mr. N. G. RUDRAPPA.—What will be the revenue to Government?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—About Rs. 6,700.

Mr. N. G. RUDRAPPA.—When will the work be taken up?

Mr. S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI.—After sanction is accorded.

Mr. N. G. RUDRAPPA.—Is it under contemplation to take it up next year?

Mr. R. W. SCALDWELL.—No. It will have to be thought of whether the increasing of the capacities of the unrestored tanks is not necessary to be simultaneously taken up.

Railway Line from Byadagi to Sagar.

Q.—35. Mr. Surangi SIDDABASAPPA (Shikarpur Taluk).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether the Railway Department had under contemplation at any time a scheme of extending the railway line from Byadagi to Sagar;

(*b*) whether the places through which the line should run have been determined and the line surveyed;

(*c*) what is the estimated cost;

(*d*) when was the estimate prepared?

A.—The SECRETARY to GOVERNMENT for RAILWAYS (Mr. B. T. Kesavaiengar).—

(*a*) No.

(*b*) The line has not been surveyed at any time before.

(*c*) No definite data can be given without detailed engineering and traffic surveys of the proposed line.

(*d*) Does not arise in view of answer to clause (*c*) above.

Mr. Surangi SIDDABASAPPA.—Do the Government agree that the extension of the railway line from Byadagi to Sagar will be helpful to a vast section of the public?

Mr. B. T. KESAVAIENGAR.—The question is beset with certain practical difficulties. Nearly a half of the tract between Sagar and Byadagi belongs to